Review

George Lardner
Newsroom
Washington Post
1150 15 St., NW
Wash.,D.C. 20005

4/23/78

Dear George,

Your review of Legend is witty, perceptive, fair and as you lamented, too short - long as it is for a review in the Post.

Your references to the Epstein-Nosenko meeting interest me much. As I'm sure you realize from the copy of the Briggs affidavit it does bear on the CIA's representations to the court and thus becomes relevant in the quasi-remand of the appeals court.

As a long-time observer of Epsteinkery I believe his account of the Nosenko meeting would have had him running off at the mouth.

What might have held no news interest could be valuable in court. If you can tell me any more about what Epsteinker told you I'd appreciate it. (In cluding his address so Jim can subpoena and depose him.)

Working in the quotes from Colby wasaaggreattiidaa.It suggests what I regard as very important if there is to be any understanding of what has happened to the various intelligence agencies (going back to World War II) and what this, in turn means and has meant to the country. In my view the sick Angletonians, domainated by fear and hatred, have turned the world around and have made fear the dominant emotion of great and powerful nations. Not just us if my greatest concern is about us.

It frightens even the ribbon mechanism of my typewriter!

I presume that with your review in and printed your interests will not include this. However, if you do later care to look into this more I will continue to accumulate what I receive. Recently it includes an Epstein piece in April Psychology Today, also sick in its studied and pseudo-scholarship of tunnel-vision "science", and a syndicated version of a Chicago Sun-Times interview with Epstein.

That the spooteries can continue to influence if not control what people may know and thus think or believe does worry me. This is an example of it. My initial view, that the book is indistinguishable from a black book, is not changed.

Epstein's account in Psychology today opens with the atatement that Readers Digest approached him in 1976 to do a book on the JFK assassination. Here two things: he did not evolve a book on the JFK assassination and for an initial approach in 1976 getting to where he could interview Nosenko in March of 1976 and be prepared for that interview is moving very fast, particularly for an Epstein, who does not regard work with joy. If they approached him on January 1 and he interviewed Nosenko on March 31 this was still pretty fast. Inlcuding for the word to get around that he was doing such a book.

One of the questions this raises is was sending Nosenko to him an effort to change his book or influence it? (You referred to a publisher's blurb. If that is not from the Publishers Weekly page I sent you I'd appreciate a copy of it because of the claims of exclusivity under FOIA when my unmet requests preceeded any of his.) Could Nosenko have converted the book from an updating of the JFK assassination, what E. says RD wanted? Assuming what it is not safe to assume, that E accurately represents what RD proposed. In this I do mean to include a CIA interest in having a widely-distributed book convey the idea that LHO was of no interest to the CIA, which had no connection with him. This does appear to have been an idea that could have emerged in the context of what was going on in the field toward the end of 1975 only part of which is the move to establish the House assassins committee.

One of the dangers I see only too often in the records I obtain is that the spookeries are able to influence what can bek known and believed. I regard this as more than just wrong - as subversive.

There is a really paranoidal "analysis" done by a KGB defector for the CIA right after the JFK assassination. It is hopelessly sick but the CIA gave it to the Rockefeller Commission, where it was influential with the junior-grade Angleton, Belin, who was already of that Nixonian preconception. Then the CIA fetched Raymond Rocca back from forced retirement to do an analysis for Belin. In it he sought to revitalize all that had been proven to be utterly wrong, like the Alvareda Ugarte fabrications.

I'd have trouble locating this because I took it from the files for another purpose several years ago but I'll ask Hoch if he can give me the citation or a copy in the event you or another reporter may want either or both. What Epstein has done is an extension of this in which he is aggressive, with all the wealth of Readers Digest behind him. (He does say they offered him unlimited financing.)

You and the Post have had no recent interest in the House assassins, which I regret. Had you or any other major paper reported what was reportable at the time renewal was up I believe it would not have been renewed. I am as opposed to misinformation and misconduct from one side as I am from the other.

Their Ray adventures of the past week are not over and are newsworthy. These adventures included overt threats against at least two and the violation of their own rules with regard to counsel. They had Travis Buckley, if Mississippi, who had been J.B.Stoner's lawyer, represent Carol Pepper. And then when the wanted to ask her about the family's relationship with Stoner, they either sought to put Buckley out of the room or they did, leaving her without counsel. Little good as Buckley was. Carol is a very nervous woman. Her recollection is not certain but she thinks they threatened her with a perjury charge when she responded other than they wanted. Jim was present when Fithian threatened John Ray with revocation of his parole. When Jim sought to correct a fabrication intended to show a Ray family-Stoner relationship prior to the extradition he was addressed in what might be taken as a threatening manner.

They recalled Carol for early May. I'll be hearing from her before then. Based on the Buckley precedent I expect her to ask Jim to represent her. She had done this prior to her appearance when the St. Louis ACLU said it would not. But under the committee's rules Jim could not rep. her and John both so he was with John only.

Earlier, through Jimmy, Lane had led the family to believe that he would represent them all. Jerry told me this long ago, Carol this past week. So if they had means and if they knew lawyers (other than Stoner and a few like him and Jim) they still had no time.

As this develops there may be an interesting situation with regard to Lane. In this connection you might want to read the new crap he added to his paperback. It was to promote this that he contrived the Jerry situation before the committee and it was for such a promotion, in Atlanta, that he promptly abandoned Jerry once he had caused his stink.

Most of the Rays are in varying degree racist. They are also by our concepts a bit strange, as we'd find this to be true of Erskine Caldwell characters. But they are incapable of having pulled the King job, any alone or all in combination. And I'm sure there was no contact with Stoner until Jimmy began to realize what the Huie-Hanes combo and deal was doing to him. Jim and I rescued xeroxes of what Jimmy did not have copies of from the DA's basement. The committee latter got some and it is one of these that Jim caught them misdated where the paper punch had eliminated most of the month.

Excuse the haste and typos. I'm late with my earlt morning exercises and the day's work follows. Meanwhile, be prepared for the charge that your review was inspired by the CIA because of its Angleton slant. Sincerely,